

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

GENERAL LIBR.
APR-1 1912
UNIV. OF MICH.

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL. V

NEW YORK, MARCH 30, 1912

No. 21

I have frequently been accused of a tendency to pessimism in these editorials. Those teachers who get through the week with a modicum of sunshine left find this suddenly obliterated by the Stygian darkness of this page. I wonder if they are right and if it really is pessimism to see a danger near at hand, or even afar off, and urge preparation against it. Only a week ago I was informed that a distinguished educator had said to his audience that it is only a matter of months at the most before we shall get rid of this ancient rubbish of the Classics and Algebra and the like; "then we shall really begin to educate". This man is not merely an isolated case. He is a type which is unfortunately present in large numbers among the educational administrators of the country, if it does not form the majority. Now, which is better: to take account of such statements and try to offset them, either by convincing the multitude of the value of our work as at present carried on, or by improving its quality so that it is beyond criticism, or to bask in the sunshine of our week's experience until it is too late to do anything? But my critics say, 'We are successful, we are doing good work; why trouble us?' Is this statement true? Are we successful? Certainly we are not by the standard of the College Entrance Board examinations, and we are not in the judgment of many thinkers. In the School Review for February the Commissioner of Education for Massachusetts in an article on The Opportunity of the Small High School deprecates the teaching of more than one foreign language in the small High School, because, as he says:

Seldom have such schools the means of teaching one at all adequately; but it is unbelievable that so many of them should palm off on the public so-called Latin, French, and German teaching which is not even a fair imitation of language teaching according to any adequate standard. Let the small high school never attempt more than one foreign language; let it teach that intensively through four years; let it permit no pupil to continue in the subject who has not real capacity for it; and incidentally, let the school obtain as a teacher of this subject one who knows something about it—if a modern language; one who can understand and use it. Americans are hospitable to shams, and yield to self-delusion in education as in other matters; but in no other respect are we so much imposed upon as in the high-school teaching of foreign language.

I am credibly informed that—as I have often emphasized, even to the verge of pessimism—the chief obstacle in the State of New York to the success

of the new syllabus in Latin is the inability of Latin teachers to teach translation at sight. Does this confirm the attitude of the Commissioner of Education of Massachusetts or does it refute it? On the other hand, I am just as credibly informed that all the teachers in the state are anxious for any suggestions that may lead to the betterment of their methods. This seems to me a very encouraging fact. The Commissioner of Massachusetts insists that the weakness in the teaching of foreign languages lies especially in the small high school in the small towns in the state. Is this true? In the City of New York do we make such a success of the teaching of Latin to our High School pupils that the great majority of every class is really prepared for promotion at the end of the term? These questions have to be answered because persons not our friends are answering them in a way that we do not like.

Meanwhile, one of the most enlightened criticisms upon college instruction was made by Professor Oldfather of the University of Illinois in an article in the Educational Review for November last, on Common Sense and the Elective System. The gist of the article is given in the concluding words:

To conclude, one might draw up a table of those subjects which (1) must be studied in college, if ever, e. g., the science (including psychology), mathematics, the ancient languages, and the early periods of the modern languages; (2) those which ought to be studied in college at least so far as the point of view is concerned, but pursued further after graduation, e. g., philosophy and logic, history, economics, political science, English literature, and the modern languages as literary criticism; (3) those which may be taken in college, but can with profit be both begun and continued after graduation, e. g., English literature and the modern languages as mere reading and for practical purposes, art, music, household science, etc.

It has always seemed very strange to me that thinking men could actually defend the wide extension of college courses in those fields which, if the student were properly trained, should afford the relaxation and the joy of his postcollegiate life. I refer to the courses in English literature, in modern foreign literatures, in history and similar things, i. e. those mentioned in the second part of Professor Oldfather's summary. Historical method and the canons of historical criticism should be taught in college, but when these are once learned there is no necessity for heaping up courses in history. The

fundamentals of literary criticism, whether of English or of modern foreign languages, should be taught in college and as far as possible the taste and the habit of reading good literature should be developed, but I can see no reason for devoting the college course to extensive reading of English literature. The study of Latin and Greek literature in college is eminently desirable for the reason that there is but little opportunity for pursuing it in later life. Under our present method of instruction in these languages this is even more vitally essential because our students never get the ability to read with sufficient fluency to make the subtle enjoyment of Greek or Latin literature an easy matter.

It would be too much to hope that the interested classes will consent to a modification of the college curriculum along the lines suggested in Professor Oldfather's essay, for vested interests are always a serious obstacle in the path of reform. But to my mind the division of the subjects suggested is thoroughly sound and should be recognized in any properly organized college.

G. L.

A Latin Grammar. By Harry Edwin Burton. Boston: Silver, Burdett and Company (1911). Pp. xii + 337. \$0.90.

(Concluded from page 156.)

In the part of the book dealing with Syntax there are many sections whose wording, though not in all cases original, impresses the reviewer favorably for clearness and freshness of expression: notable examples are §§ 405, 411, 451, 502-504, 510, 528, 549, 650, 680, 698, 699, 709, 743, 756, 795, 798, 821, 907 ff. (on conditions), 938. Yet sometimes statements are made in too difficult a way for the learner readily to grasp their purport, as in 789, 863, 886. Many sections fail to be clear, as 431 (the statement about ellipsis of *crimine* needs amplification); 464 (the last statement gives the impression that the preposition itself governs the dative); 481 ("to avoid ambiguity" is itself not clear); 499; 523; 545; 593; 700; 734^a (inadequate, for the reflexive is sometimes accusative and sometimes dative in idea); 763; 764^b; 827 (the second statement); 845; 890; 894; 898 (the difference between adversative and concessive is not adequately explained). Cross-references are sometimes needed, as to § 735 in § 388, to §§ 998-999 in § 990. Other sections need examples for illustration, as 381 (examples of appositives not agreeing in number, or not in gender, or not in either); 426; 432; 440; 444^c; 458; 554 (an example of ablative of manner with *cum* and adjective is desirable); 582 (an example of *quod . . . eō*); 622; 727; 793 (an example of the primary sequence; also one of a subjunctive depending upon a present infinitive or present participle that depends upon a secondary tense). A desire to limit the size of the book is not a sufficient reason for the absence of examples in these sections.

But above all, the translation of the examples should make clear the peculiarities of syntax illustrated, and not be merely proof of the author's mastery of English, if they are to help the student in the preparatory school. While Professor Burton does not sin in this respect to the extent of Lane-Morgan—whose grammar, moreover, could hardly be used except by advanced students, though to such it is indispensable—there are many examples that are hardly translated in the (pedagogically) best way. Thus in § 346 *ventum est* is rendered by 'some one came' but it means also, and more often, 'they (he, we) came'. In § 356 *peccare licet nēmini* is translated by 'no one is at liberty to sin', which does not bring out the point, that *peccare* is the subject of *licet*. In § 628, *scūta latentia condunt*, to illustrate the prolepsis, must be translated 'they put their shields away so that they are concealed', not 'they put their shields away in concealment'. In § 556 the translation of *cum* in Cat. 1. 33 is misleading or wrong: the passage means 'attended by your own ruin and destruction'; translation by *to* makes the phrase express tendency (§ 483). In § 668 the last example is wrongly explained, for the words quoted are all spoken by Catiline, to whom, as subject of the verb of saying earlier in the passage, the *sibi* refers. How *idem* (§ 726) means 'moreover' or 'yet' is not clear, unless it be translated 'likewise', 'yet likewise'. The last example of § 749 means rather 'now at last (= after this respite) exact the penalty'. In § 916 the translation is ambiguous, as 'strike fearless' may be understood as 'make fearless'. In § 946 both examples need literal and free translations, as the idiom is both difficult and important, and the free translation of the second should be 'from this the regard of all Gaul would be turned away from him'. In § 962 the translation of the last example makes the infinitive a direct object, and not an infinitive of purpose. Similar defects are found in the translations in §§ 438, ex. 1; 696, ex. 2; 792, last ex.; 800, ex. 1; 827, ex. 1; 995, ex. 2.

Further, some examples are not typical, or are not certainly illustrative of the rule. Thus in § 368 the question quoted is only part of a twofold question, neither part of which should be quoted alone, 'Did Scipio kill Gracchus, and yet shall we bear with Catiline?'; in this the first part of the question is a logical protasis to the second. In example 1 of § 385, *principium* may be nominative just as well as accusative. In § 390, example 2 needs a note pointing out that *vōs* is accusative; otherwise the student may think it nominative, and expect *probī*, by § 951. In § 497, three kinds of accusatives are confused under one heading. In examples 2 and 3 of § 627, the predicate adjectives do not modify the nouns through the medium of a verb, as is called for by the rule; the error is in the rule. The last example in § 628 is not one of the proleptic use of an adjective, but is exactly like example 3 of § 627. The idiom of the

last example of § 663 is not normal; cf. § 403. The example in § 700 illustrates the hanging nom., not the rule in the paragraph. In example 2 of § 708 the relative need not be translated by a demonstrative. In § 772, *Tē ut ḫlla rēs frangat?* Cat. 1. 22, may not be a direct question introduced by *ut*, but a purpose clause depending upon the preceding *Quid loquor?* In the last example but one of § 926, *darēs* is rather a past jussive. It is noticeable that a rule often embraces several points, and the examples, covering these points, follow without distinguishing marks, making the section difficult to use: so in §§ 566; 710; 881; 912; etc.

The following miscellaneous comments on the Syntax occur to the reviewer. The definition of a phrase (§ 361) is inexact, since an historical infinitive or an infinitive of indirect discourse with one other word may form a clause, yet is not excluded by the definition of phrase. A predicate noun is said to be "rarely in the ablative" (§ 394)—really it is very often so, as in *M. Messālā M. Pīsōne cōnsulibus*; the misstatement is caused by the lack of a present participle of the verb *be* in Latin. The term Possessive Genitive (§ 401) should not be extended to include origin, cause, etc. The construction in § 419 is hardly an extension of the genitive of the whole. The difference in meaning of verbs of *remembering* as they govern genitive or accusative (§§ 438 f.) is, if real, not perceptible according to these definitions, which occur also in other grammars. In § 456 a list of the common verbs taking the dative is needed. To say that the dative of agent is developed from the dative of possession (§ 480) does not help a student, besides being a statement of doubtful validity. To render § 527 perfectly clear, the words 'in Latin' should be inserted after the word 'Ablative' near the beginning of each sentence. Some other details might well be added on the ablative of source (§ 532). The rule in § 579 should be amplified to show that words meaning 'exchange' mean either 'give in exchange' or 'get in exchange'. The statement on months (§ 604) should be fuller, for in preparatory Latin practically all dates are before 45 B. C., in the old complicated calendar.

Neuter adjectives as substantives are common also as predicate nominative (§ 636), as in example 1. In § 640, the important topic of substantivization by ellipsis of a substantive is passed by without notice. On the meaning of *primus*, Aen. I. 1 (§ 641), see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 3. 110, 150-151, 183. The statement in § 644 is reversed, and should be: "The superlative is used with *quam* and a form of *possum* to denote the highest possible degree; the form of *possum* is often omitted". *Is* as a reflexive pronoun (§ 719) is used only as the *indirect* reflexive. Reciprocal *alius . . . aliis* and *alter . . . alter* (§ 731) never occur with both words in the

same construction; it would be much better to write *alius . . . aliū*, etc. An easier translation of the idiom in § 732 is 'different', as in 'Nature points out different ways to different men'.

The annalistic present is ignored in § 748. In *ēnārrem* (§ 768), the *a* is probably short. The limits of the use of the indicative as potential (§ 780) are not set. In § 797 much utility would be gained by adding "From this, the relative becomes often a demonstrative or personal pronoun; cf. § 662". The use of the future and future perfect tenses in *cum-temporal* clauses, being unlike English usage, needs remark (§ 856). The convenient terms *cum inversum* (§ 858), *cum explicative* (§ 893: temporal rather than causal), *iterative* (§ 904) are not employed; in § 865 'prevented' would be an improvement on 'fore-stalled'. On the other hand, the adoption of the terms 'dative of purpose or tendency' (§ 483) and 'measure of difference' (§ 582), and of the explanation of *per* with the accusative as means, not agency (§ 537), is to be commended.

"By the analogy of the subjunctive with *cum*" is as desirable an explanation in § 870 as in § 873. *Dum*-clauses may denote means (cf. Hor. Epist. 1. 7. 80) as well as cause (§ 880). The perfect infinitive for the present in such expressions as are found in § 944 really has the meaning of a future perfect. § 966 does not account for a secondary sequence depending upon a perfect infinitive that itself depends upon a primary verb, though § 793 makes the statement, and example 7 of § 969 illustrates it. §§ 1003 ff. leave obscure how the case of a substantive modified by a gerundive is regulated. 'Between themselves' (§ 1044) is a Latinism for 'with each other'. § 1063 is badly arranged: its first part is subdivision (7) of a statement at the end of § 1056, and its second part is a heading to §§ 1064-1067. § 1068* fails to note that substantive clauses introduced by *quod*, 'as to the fact that', normally precede, not follow, the main clause.

Figures of Speech and Rhetoric are treated in § 1070. On these some comments are in order. The use of *case* in "Anastrophe is the use of a preposition after its case" is objectionable. The example of Hypallage is too difficult; why not use Aen. I. 4? The example of simile is bad, since the word 'sword' does not appear in the Latin. Under synesis, a reference to § 630 would be useful.

The chapter on Versification is in general good, but needs a few typical lines written out and marked with the customary signs. The definition of length by position (§ 1071) lacks the statement about mute + liquid (§§ 22-24): some of the material in § 23 would be more valuable here. In view of compounds like *rēn-eō*, *anim-advertō*, *n-allus*, etc., it is at least not certain that the Romans merely 'slurred the final (= elided) sound' (§ 1077): and on non-elision in certain monosyllables it may be noted that *dem*

suffers elision in Lucil. 577 (Marx). In § 1078, an example of semi-hiatus is needed. *Periclō* (§ 1087) is the original form, not a syncopated form of *periculō*; a valid example is *repostum*, Aen. 1. 26. The real rule for iambic shortening (§ 1089) is better stated thus: "A long syllable immediately before or after the metrical stress may be treated as short if the preceding syllable, whether in the same or in another word, is short". Such examples as *cómpedēs cōgam*, Plaut. Persa 782, and *péssum(ē) órnátus*, Aul. 721, violate Professor Burton's formulation of the rule. § 1095 should admit the main caesura in the third foot.

In taking exception to so many points, the reviewer has not forgotten that criticism is largely subjective, and naturally so; and that another might hardly agree with him in the majority of the points—certainly not in all. Yet to make sure that he was not carping unjustly at a book when all others were as bad or worse, he has attentively read over great sections of the other standard school and college grammars, and has found that while they were not perfect—in his opinion—they offered fewer points to which he would raise objection than does the book under discussion. He therefore feels that Professor Burton's Grammar cannot be considered as making advances upon those already in the field, and that it presents errors and imperfections that will prevent its adoption over others. At the same time he believes that these flaws are removable, and that a careful working over both from the standpoint of facts and of presentation would render this book, in a second edition, the equal of any other current grammar with the same aims, and entirely acceptable to any teacher of Latin.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

ROLAND G. KENT.

HEAD OF A GREEK ATHLETE¹

In his Masterpieces of Greek Sculpture, Professor Furtwängler called attention to a fine marble head of a Greek athlete in the possession of Lord Leconfield, at Petworth, which up to that time had been little appreciated or even known among students of Greek art. He adjudged it correctly as a copy of a lost original of the fifth century B. C., and even named the sculptor to whom he thought the original could be ascribed, a point which we may pass over for the moment. That the original was an important statue was to be inferred not only from the merits of the Petworth head, but from the fact that he could cite three other copies of it, one in the Riccardi Palace in Florence, another—a fragment of one side only—in the Museum at Trèves, and a third, formerly in the possession of a Roman dealer. To these four must now be added a fifth, a life-size head which was purchased by the Museum last summer, out of funds

¹ Reprinted from Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, for March, 1912.

from the Hewitt bequest, and is now on exhibition in the Room of Recent Accessions.

Its resemblance to the Petworth head is so close as to leave no doubt of a common derivation, but it is distinctly the more beautiful of the two, and in the subtlety of the modeling is probably a more faithful reproduction of the original, full of the spirit of fifth-century work¹.

Aside from the beauty of the features, the head has a certain romantic quality which is unusual in Greek art, especially of this period, and which doubtless adds to its attractiveness from a modern point of view, though it is largely accidental and can be explained on other grounds. The head is evidently from a statue representing a young athlete, who is marked as a victor by the fillet which he wears, the badge of victory in an athletic contest. Some further idea of the figure may be gained from the fact that the head was not carried erect, but, as the lines of the neck show, bent considerably to the right. Also, there is on the top of the head a small square projection—repeated on three of the other copies—which from analogy is to be interpreted as a support for an arm, indicating that he stood with one arm resting on his head, a pose not uncommon in statues of the fifth century. He was, therefore, a victorious athlete resting after a competition, and the impression of melancholy made by the face—heighthened now by the discoloration of the marble, which intensifies the shadows in and about the eyes—was intended by the sculptor only as a suggestion of physical fatigue.

The main thing that the sculptor sought to express was his ideal of the beauty of young manhood in its perfect development in which the physical and intellectual elements were harmoniously blended, as far removed as possible from brutality on the one hand, or sentimentality on the other; and in the success with which that ideal has been achieved, our head must be regarded as an example of a very high order. The broad, low forehead, with its almost imperceptible swelling above the brows, the low curve of the latter, and the sharp angle at which the eyes are set below them, the slight but intentional difference in the size of the eyes, the delicate oval of the cheeks tapering to the small chin, and the finely modeled nose and mouth, all play their part in making up the beauty of the face, the simple lines of which are accentuated by the thick, almost turbulent masses of curly hair above it.

Some of these characteristics are so individual, and make the head so different from the types of the better-known sculptors of the fifth century, as to lead us to seek its creator among the artists of the period who are less famous to-day. Among these is

¹ The best illustrations of the Petworth head are the atlas of the German edition of Furtwängler's *Meisterwerke*, pl. XVI. Two views of it are also given in the English edition, figs. 64, 65, where it is discussed on pp. 161 ff.

Kresilas, to whom Furtwängler attributed the original of the Petworth head, together with other works of a similar character.

All we know definitely about the life of this sculptor is that he was born at Kydonia, in Crete, and that he was active in the second half of the fifth century B. C. Inscriptions from three pedestals, bearing his signature, have been found on the Akropolis of Athens, which make it probable that he worked in that city during part of his career, more especially because one of the pedestals had belonged to a statue of Perikles. That statue, by the way, was probably the one which called forth the admiration of Pliny, who says that Kresilas made "an Olympian Perikles, worthy of the epithet, and it is wonderful how in this art he made noble men more noble"—a remark which might well be applied to our head. A fourth inscription with his signature has been found in Argolis, and as this is written in Argive characters. Furtwängler regarded it as proof that he worked also in that district, though one such inscription could hardly be regarded as establishing the fact, as it might have been made by a local stonemason for a statue sent from another place. However this may be, several other statues by him are mentioned by ancient writers, chiefly Pliny, the best known being his Amazon at Ephesos, which was regarded as ranking next to those by Pheidias and Polykleitos among the various figures of Amazons erected there. This fact alone would establish him as one of the great sculptors of his time, and it is unfortunate that we have so little knowledge of his style and characteristics as an artist. Furtwängler assumed that the well-known busts of Perikles in the British Museum and the Vatican were copied from the statue referred to above, and upon them based his attribution of other heads and statues which he classed as works by or derived from Kresilas. Among these our head may properly be classed. The assumption, however, remains a conjecture which though plausible is not yet established. E. R.

REVIEWS

Latin Prose Composition. Part I: Based on Caesar.

By William Gardner Hale, with the Collaboration of Charles Henry Beeson and Wilbert Lester Carr. Chicago: Atkinson, Mentzer and Grover (1910). Pp. XII + 137. 50 cents.

The primary principle followed by Professor Hale and his Associates in making this book seems to have been to derive directly from the Latin which the student is reading the Latin which he is to write. Here is a confession of faith as set forth in the preface:

Reading and writing should go hand in hand. The incidents of any given exercise, and the new words and new constructions demanded by it, should be

selected from the reading presumably done by the student since he wrote the last exercise preceding it. The incidents should be true to the facts and the spirit of the original—in this case, the first four books of the Gallic War. A composition book should be a companion to the author—an aid, and not a source of confusion.

This book, then, is constructed in conformity with these precepts: each lesson begins with a list of constructions culled from the Caesar recently read; references for these are given to several commonly-used Grammars, together with brief explanatory comments, which are often marvels of conciseness and lucidity; then follows a reasonable number of sentences to be turned into Latin, the subject-matter and vocabulary of which are also drawn from the text just studied, and which, while connected in thought, are numbered for class-room purposes. Footnotes are attached to these, which betray the laudable intent of trying to make the student think. The lessons are thirty-five in number, one for each week of the school-year, and each contains only so much material as may be mastered in the allotted time. A supplementary series of lessons, likewise thirty-five in number, is added, to be used as the teacher may find advisable. The division of the four books of Caesar into weekly portions seems to have been made with exceeding care and wisdom; the war with Ariovistus (I. 30-54) is put at the end of the fourth book; except for this change the student reads his author consecutively. At the end of the book is a vocabulary, and an appendix containing two tables, one of the case uses and another of the sub-junctives.

On the first page which is designed for the pupil, Professor Hale, in a brief introduction entitled Why We Write Latin, declares that the main purpose of studying composition is to make the reading of Latin easier and surer. To such a dictum no one will take exception; what is the best method, however, of attaining the desired end? On this point opinions naturally enough differ. It is the belief of the reviewer that composition can most effectively aid Latin reading by collecting the *disiecta membra* surviving from the initial year, and building upon this as a framework a fairly complete synopsis of Latin grammar. Professor Hale's book, by its strict adherence to the text read in class, necessarily presents a view, not of Latin syntax in general, but of that of the first four books of the *Bellum Gallicum*. Even if Caesar were the only Latin ever to be read by the student, it is doubtful whether this method would be the wisest, most logical preparation: on four days of the week the class is busied with the interpretation of the author, and the principles which arise to his consciousness are likely to appear more or less isolated and unrelated: the composition period is the hour of synthesis, and the grammar then studied should be that of the language as a whole, with

essentials emphasized and minor points properly subordinated. The chief defect of Professor Hale's book—I am speaking of its plan in general, and except certain particulars to be mentioned later—is a fundamental tendency to analyze rather than to synthesize.

It must be acknowledged that not yet is Professor Hale's grammatical system one of the utmost simplicity, and indeed, his note to teachers on pages 97 to 110, *Correspondences and Differences in Terminology and Treatment*, is really an apologia; he maintains, and to an appreciable extent proves, that he is not excessively unorthodox in his nomenclature or irrational in his categories. There is no accepted treatment of Latin syntax; those Grammars which are considered conventional, which are supposed to have preserved the traditions of the true school, often vary greatly in their handling of a particular construction, for the very excellent reason that no one of the terms at their disposal exactly fits the case in question. Professor Hale urges, therefore, first a new determination of the actual forces of the constructions by an unbiased observation of the Latin, and secondly a re-naming of these constructions, if such a step be necessary, in order that there may be no "confusing gap between the technical grammatical term and the actual idea". No teacher can deny that one of the greatest obstacles to success in teaching any subject is the readiness of pupils to make use of technical terms in an unnecessarily unintelligent, parrot-like fashion. To overcome this it manifestly behoves us to employ those terms which inherently possess the most significance. Yet while agreeing "that an exactly descriptive name is the best and easiest class-room tool: an inexact name is a bad and blundering tool", we can not help recognizing the possibility of so increasing the number of tools that the young workman may become confused, forgetful, careless, and despairing. Certainly a thorough mastery of fewer instruments is preferable to such a contingency.

In regard to details, the doctors who would attempt to simplify Professor Hale's syntax will doubtless disagree. An excellent feature, because of its synthetical purport, is the correlating of analogous constructions; for example, instead of An Adjective attributes a Quality, Genitive or Ablative of Quality, Relative Clause of Characteristic, and *Cum*-Clause describing the Circumstances, this book proffers Descriptive Adjective, Descriptive Genitive or Ablative; Descriptive Relative Clause, and Descriptive *Cum*-Clause of Situation. Again, under the caption, Dative with Verbs and Adjectives of Quality, Attitude, or Relation we find brought together two similar case uses which most Grammars treat separately. On the other hand, it seems to require some mental readjustment to discover in Degree of Activity or Quality three of our old friends—Extent of Space, Duration

of Time, and the Cognate or Adverbial Accusative which appears in such expressions as *plurimum possunt*. Very valuable is the parallel drawn between the two kinds of *Cum*-Clauses, known to most of us as the *Dating* and the *Circumstantial*, and the corresponding *Qui*-Clauses, the *Relative Clause of Fact* and the *Characteristic Subjunctive*; Professor Hale calls the indicatives *Determinate* and the subjunctives *Descriptive*.

To certain of the case usages more accurate or comprehensive titles are given by the adding of a word or two to their ordinary names, as *Genitive of Possession or Connection* (the latter to cover such phrases as *gloria belli*, B. G. 1. 2); *Dative of Tendency or Purpose*; *Dative of Reference or Concern*; *Ablative of Cause or Reason*; *Ablative of Route or Way by Which*. New headings, for constructions provided with no 'working names' in other Grammars, are *Genitive of Application* (connected with the *Objective Genitive*), *Ablative of Accordance*, and *Ablative of the Point of View from Which*.

This is not the place to discuss the categories of the subjunctive which Professor Hale champions; granted that they be accepted, it would seem that the presentation, in the table on pages 136-137, of such incongruous classes as *Volition*, *Anticipation*, *Obligation or Propriety*, *Possibility or Capacity*, *Imagined case (condition)* and *act certain in that case (conclusion)*, and *Ideas of Fact* (in *Consecutive Clauses* and *Clauses of Consecutive Origin*, in *Indirect Discourse*, and in *Attracted Clauses*), could be made more intelligible and teachable by grouping these usages under the original forces of the mood—I mean the four usually given, not those postulated in the Hale-Buck Grammar 459—and by making some use of the division, certainly well-grounded both logically and historically, into independent sentences and dependent clauses. Although the student may have such a table in his Grammar, yet it should be repeated in the composition book, and in exactly the same form and with the same fullness, even if all the constructions may not be illustrated in the exercises to be translated into Latin.

The names *Volition* and *Anticipation* are convenient and justifiable. Professor Hale differs from most grammarians in referring the subjunctive in clauses of fear to the *Volitive* signification, basing this theory on the analogous construction in Greek. The *Optative Subjunctive*, by the way, is omitted entirely from the table; one also longs to catch a glimpse of the familiar old *Potential*, if merely as a discarded parent of some of its self-assertive young substitutes: *Imagined case* and *act certain in that case* is, to my mind, an unsatisfactory and clumsy appellation. Yet Professor Hale and his collaborators evidently intended that these tables of the appendix should be supplementary and incidental, and it is hardly fair to dwell on their deficiencies, except

that they do, to some extent, sum up the teachings of the whole book.

The book is well printed on good paper, and is neat and attractive in appearance. The three illustrations are somewhat murky, and add little of value. The only misprint that I have detected is on page 108, line 12: B. 281, 1 should be B. 283, 1. In conclusion I would emphasize the two great merits of this manual: the remarkably helpful explanatory remarks which follow the grammatical headings at the beginning of each lesson, and the exercises for translation into Latin, which are construed with extreme care and no small amount of pedagogical insight.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY.

HAROLD L. CLEASBY.

Comparative Grammar of the Greek Language. By Joseph Wright. London and New York: Oxford University Press. (1912). Pp. xx + 384.

An Oxford professor of comparative philology, whose chief interest is in the Germanic languages, gives us a comparative grammar of Greek intended for students who are unfamiliar with linguistic science. He presents no large collections of evidence about the facts of the language such as those in Lindsay's Latin Language, and no independent working over of the subject after the manner of Sommer or Hirt. "All I have attempted to do", he says, "is to furnish our countrymen with a systematic and scientific treatment of Comparative Greek Grammar based upon the philological books and articles of the best workers of the present day in the wide field of comparative philology". The subject is further restricted by the omission of syntax except for a few remarks that seemed inseparable from the morphology.

A distinctive feature of the book is the citation of numerous illustrative examples. While Sommer regularly supports his phonological formulae by only four instances of each, and Hirt contents himself with the briefest possible statement of a dozen or less, Wright gives fourteen examples of α = I. -E. $\dot{\alpha}$, and twenty-seven of ϵ = I. -E. $\dot{\epsilon}$. There is a world of truth in the motto on the title page: "Nur das Beispiel führt zum Licht; Vieles Reden thut es nicht". But the best methods may easily be carried too far. What useful purpose is served by listing fifty-two neuters in $-os$ (p. 133) or seventy derivatives in $-po-$ and $-po\bar{o}-$ (p. 124)?

A second praiseworthy feature is the introduction in the sections on morphology of detailed explanations of the several paradigms. Not only is the relationship between the Greek forms and the corresponding forms of the parent speech stated in full, but enough is told about the related words in Sanskrit, Latin, and Germanic so that the learner can usually appreciate the evidence for the reconstructed forms.

It is the lack of such treatment in books like Giles's Manual and, to a lesser degree, in the German handbooks, that has convinced many casual readers that comparative philology is merely a huge structure of arbitrary assumptions bolstered up by an abstruse terminology and a system of curious symbols.

In the earlier part of the book, however, where the reader is presumably in complete ignorance of the subject, such help is rarely given. Here he is confronted, for example, with the startling statement that " $\theta\acute{e}as$ <is> from an original form **dhwesido*" (p. 11). There is a cross-reference, to be sure, but when we look it up we merely find the same statement repeated. Clearly one who writes for beginners should not base his argument upon statements which his readers cannot verify. In this respect, however, our author sins less than others.

The book is based chiefly upon Brugmann's works and Hirt's *Handbuch der griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre*. The author gives (pp. xiv-xvii) a "Select List of Books used", in which there are several strange omissions. There has been little attempt to use the literature that has appeared since Hirt (1902), except for the second edition of the second volume of Brugmann's *Grundriss* (1906-1911) and two or three other books.

In the few places where the author has ventured to desert his two leading authorities the result is disastrous. This is notably true of the chapter on ablaut (pp. 49-61). No doubt a desire for brevity led to the rejection of Hirt at this point, but why the lucid statement of the matter in Brugmann's *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik* was thought unsatisfactory does not appear. Instead we have a confusing and altogether impossible modification of Hirt's system. What shall we say of a scholar who apparently holds that the first syllable of *θερβί*, *φαμίν*, etc., "originally had a secondary accent" (p. 52, § 86)? Fortunately there is nothing else in the book so bad as the chapter on ablaut.

There is, however, one other very serious drawback. The style can only be characterized as atrocious. Almost every page presents some crudity such as "the phenomenon of what is called ablaut, or vowel gradation" (p. 49), "a bandage worn by runners on the ankle" (p. 93), or "on . . . Cypr. and dial. of Phocis *alfei* see § 57" (p. 76). Pleonasms such as "most scholars are now generally agreed", "compare together", are excessively common. The otiose already becomes especially wearisome. A favorite form of expression is a passive with *became* instead of *was*; e. g. *became extracted*, *became used*.

With all its faults, the book will have to be recommended to students as the most convenient means of getting a knowledge of the subject. But teachers should warn them to skip chapter IV and not to blame the subject for the uncouth style.

HARVARD COLLEGE.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College, 325 West 120th Street, New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the language, the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY**), are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

Outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY** is one dollar per year.

Editor-in-Chief

GONZALEZ LODGE, Teachers College, Columbia University

Managing Editor

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

Associate Editors

ERNEST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

HARRY L. WILSON, Johns Hopkins University

Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, books for review, queries, etc., should be sent to the Managing Editor. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

Caesar for Sight Reading

By Towle and Jenks

CLOTH .40

This book includes the most interesting portions of Caesar, and is so carefully edited that the class which has been well drilled on the first two books of the Gallic War will be able to read this readily and with pleasure. Special stress is laid on acquiring a vocabulary.

D. C. Heath & Company

Boston

New York

Chicago

HALE'S LATIN PROSE COMPOSITION

By WILLIAM GARDNER HALE, Head of the Latin Department, University of Chicago.

Cloth, 50 cents.

The book plans as much material only as can be written in one year; this is assumed to be one lesson a week. The entire ground may therefore be covered without leaving gaps in the pupil's study of constructions. The work is confined to those constructions which are common in Caesar. The sentences are not longer than those in other books, but they follow the narrative, are continuous, and are sensible.

The book contains a vocabulary, and most helpfully arranged tables of case-uses and mood-uses. References are given to all the grammars in common use.

ATKINSON, MENTZER & COMPANY

New York

Chicago

Boston

Dallas

Collar and Daniell's

First Year Latin

I have found Collar and Daniell's *First Year Latin* an excellent preparatory book. Its high rank and long-continued use are outward proofs of its inward merit.

W. Gear Spencer, Department of Latin,
Colgate Academy, Hamilton, N. Y.

GINN AND COMPANY
70 Fifth Avenue NEW YORK

Noteworthy New Books

Barss's Third Year Latin for	Sight Reading	\$0.40
Bishop, <i>King and Helen's Cicero</i> :		
Ten Orations and Letters		1.25
Six Orations		1.00
Janes's Second Year Latin for		
Sight Reading		.40
Latin Sight Reading, Second Year		.30
Nutting's A Latin Primer		.50

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY
New York Cincinnati Chicago

THE LAKE CLASSICAL SERIES

includes distinctive and progressive
textbooks in Latin and Greek

Sight reading is now supplied free in the paper class texts in Latin, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee appointed by the American Philological Association and the requirements of the New York State Regents. Correspondence invited.

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

623 South Wabash Ave., Chicago 37 East 28th St., New York

W H Y

"A Latin Grammar," by PROFESSOR H. E. BURTON, of Dartmouth College, is the best grammar for both secondary schools and colleges on the market to-day:

In it Latin seems more like a living language than in any other grammar.

Its treatment of the formation of words under the separate parts of speech is clear and logical. It has a most effective method of showing the relative importance of the facts stated.

357 Pages 50 Cents
Send for descriptive circular

SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY

Boston

New York

Chicago